DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 897 SO 014 728

AUTHOR Wallace, James M.
TITLE The Crossroads of Liberalism in Journalism and Education.
PUB DATE 14 Apr 83
NOTE 77p.; A briefer version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom; Comparative Analysis; *Educational History; Educational Philosophy; Efficiency; Journalism; Periodicals; Political Issues; *Press Opinion; Progressive Education; *School Role; *Social Action; United States History
IDENTIFIERS Dewey (John); *Liberalism; Nation (Journal); New Republic (Journal)

ABSTRACT

Political responses to the "cult of efficiency" in the schools, academic freedom, and the role of education in social reform between 1914 and 1921 are traced in issues of the "Nation" and the "New Republic." The variety within political liberalism at the time was reflected in a similar diversity of educational positions. Until 1918, the "Nation," as a proponent of the Wilsonian New Freedom, was often suspicious of progressive developments in the schools; the "New Republic," a spokesman for Roosevelt's New Nationalism, was a vigorous partisan of John Dewey's educational progressivism. In 1918, with a change of editors, the "Nation" shifted to a political position more like that of the "New Republic." Although prior to the change the two periodicals could be characterized as vehicles for the old ("Nation") and new ("New Republic") liberalism, both journals expressed suspicion of the efficiency movement in education, consistently supported a greater measure of freedom for instructors at all levels, and believed that schools and colleges should be instruments of reform. Both journals expressed the belief that education could not fulfill its social function by uncritically transmitting values and traditions of the culture. The importance of having outspoken journals defending values somewhat at variance with those of the larger society is illustrated by the response these journals received from prominent members of the educational community. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James M. Wallace

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED232897

THE CROSSROADS OF LIBERALISM IN JOURNALISM AND EDUCATION

James M. Wallace

James Wallace is Professor of Education at Lewis and Clark College in Portland, Oregon.

A briefer version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Montreal on April 14, 1983.

SP 021 738

ABSTRACT

THE CROSSROADS OF LIBERALISM IN JOURNALISM AND EDUCATION

James M. Wallace

Two major strands in political progressivism, the Wilsonian and the Rooseveltian, each had its distinctive response to educational developments between 1914 and 1921. These distinctive responses are traced in the pages of the NATION and the NEW REPUBLIC during this period through three major issues:

the "cult of efficiency" in the schools;

academic freedom; and

the role of education in social reform.

The conclusions of the study are:

1) Liberal journals are useful sources in tracing progressive responses to educational developments;
2) Between 1914 and 1918, the NATION represented the "New Freedom" branch of progressivism; during this period its positions on educational matters were less reformist, more traditional, and more individualistic than those of the NEW REPUBLIC;
3) After 1918, when the NATION moved politically to the left, it took positions on education similar to those of the NEW REPUBLIC: more sympathetic to the "new education," more committed to schools as means of social reform, and more willing to use power rather than persuasion in promoting educational change.

The Crossroads of Liberalism in Journalism and Education

I. Liberal Journalism and American Education

In the fall of 1914, Randolph Bourne, soon to be known as one of America's leading young intellectuals, visited the high school in Bloomfield, New Jersey, from which he had graduated eleven years before. He sat in the back of one of the classrooms and attentively watched the teacher and students.[1]

Bourne was a sensitive, perceptive observer, and he was not favorably impressed by what he saw. In his report on the visit, published in the first issue of the New Republic, he noted that many of the students seemed justifiably bored by class proceedings which had little relevance to any of their present or future needs. But through years of conditioning the pupils had developed "that good-humored tolerance which has to take the place of enthusiastic interest in our American school." They joined loyally with their teacher in "slowly putting the hour out of its agony."[2]

Bourne tried to see what parallel this strange activity might have in adult life. It was clearly unrelated to anything in the world of productive work - to processes in business, industry, or the professions. The closest analogue he could think of was the procedure followed in a legislative body: no one spoke unless called on; the chairman-teacher recognized those who might wish to speak; passivity reigned. It was barely possible that the procedures in this class might find a counterpart in the future activities of some prospective legislator among the students, but

this was exceedingly unlikely, and certainly did not justify the waste of time indulged in here.

Bourne was bothered also by the psychological assumptions on which the class seemed to be based. The students were expected to think without talking, as though these were two completely separable processes.[3] The classroom atmosphere was constraining, unstimulating, passive. Learning was not seen as a process in which students would actively use their minds to solve problems.

Bourne was conscious also of the external economic pressures and influences upon the school: "Now I know all about the logic of the classroom, the economies of time, money and management that have to be met . . . . Hand-educated children have had to go the way of hand-made buttons." But in an early critique of the "cult of efficiency" in education, Bourne declared that there was a fundamental difference between the masses of machinery brought together in a modern factory and the masses of children in school:[4]

> The difference is that, unlike cotton looms, massed children make a social group, and that the mind and personality can only be developed by the freely inter-stimulating play of minds in a group.

Bourne concluded his report to New Republic readers with what might be termed criticism by definition: "Call this thing that goes on in the modern schoolroom schooling, if you like. Only don't call it education."

Thus in the first issue of the New Republic were identified some of the educational issues with which liberal journalism would be concerned over the years:[5] the aims and functions of education, the psychological assumptions underlying the educative process,

the role of the teacher, the place of efficiency in the schools and the reciprocal impact of school and society upon one another.

The New Republic and the Nation are journals of small circulation, addressed primarily to liberal intellectuals. Both have had considerable influence on American thought and politics, and both have given extended and thoughtful attention to educational concerns.[6] But no intensive analysis has been made of the relationship between these journals and American education. This paper will explore that relationship for the period between 1914 and 1921.

Historians like Charles Forcey, D. Joy Humes, Alan Grimes, Michael Wreszin and Richard Pells have studied the intellectual and political roles of the liberal journals, but have given only slight attention to their relationships with education.[7] Lawrence Cremin has used the liberal journals as sources, and has placed the progressive education movement in its political and social context, but has not explored the divergent educational expressions of the "old" and "new" liberalisms described by Forcey.[8] Rush Welter has perhaps come closest to dealing directly with the material with which this paper is concerned. He has analyzed the relationship of education to American political thought, and has considered the contributions which Herbert Croly and Walter Lippmann - two of the founders of the New Republic - made to the dialogue on this subject. But he has depended almost exclusively upon their books as sources, and has made little use of their more influential and extensive journalistic efforts.[9] He has also explored the relationships between educational and political thought in the nineteenth-century liberalism represented by the

early Nation, but has not recorded the survival of much of that "old" liberal ideology (with its educational component) well into the twentieth century.[10]

Other studies in educational history have drawn extensively on journalistic sources.[11] Some have utilized the Nation and the New Republic for certain periods, but none has studied in detail the relationship of liberal journalism and education. For the most part these studies have focused strictly on educational developments, and have given inadequate attention to the social, ideological and political context in which these occurred.

This study, concentrating specifically on liberal journalism, and utilizing some of the insights of books such as Forcey's, may add useful information and interpretation to the educational history of this period. One may look upon this as an investigation into the relationships between two educative agencies, broadly conceived. On the one hand there is the institution of formal education at all levels; on the other, the informally educative force of the liberal journals. Such journals, unlike the mass periodicals, have throughout their history aimed more at enlightenment than at entertainment. Although they have devoted themselves primarily to political concerns, they have also sought to inform their readers about developments in literature, art, music, drama and other areas of cultural and social life, including education.

Obviously the Nation and the New Republic are not the only periodicals which could be utilized in a study of education and liberal journalism. One may justify primary dependence upon them here on three counts:

1) They have been the most influential of the liberal journals in the twentieth century.

2) They have had more consistent publishing histories than other such journals.

3) They have - with occasional falls from grace - represented the broad consensus of American intellectual liberalism.

One can hardly supply evidence for these three claims without first offering a definition and history of the term "liberalism." This is, of course, an emotionally-charged word, used to condemn or commend people and movements, depending on one's point of view. It is also a source of difficulty in that it is often used interchangeably with such terms as "progressive," "radical," and "reformer."[12]

Although the term "liberal" is often applied retrospectively to the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian periods of American history, it first received broad political use by the anti-Grant Liberal Republican Party in 1872.[13] The position taken by this assortment of Mugwumps, civil service reformers and "clean government men," was clearly in the tradition of classical, bourgeois European liberalism. And at this early date, Edwin L. Godkin's New York Nation provided the scholarly commentary on events and the intellectual justification for political liberalism which was so important to these respectable reformers.[14]

But the constant friction of political reality gradually eroded the dogmas of classical liberalism. Social theorists like Lester Ward supported a positive role for the state in progress and reform. Political movements like that of the Populists

challenged the doctrinaire attachment of liberals to the gospel of small government. Theodore Roosevelt as president demonstrated some of the social potential of an activist administration.

Thus by 1912 a new liberalism, under the banner of the Progressive Party, had arisen to challenge both the stand-pat conservatism of the Republicans under Taft and the old liberalism of the Democrats. In the election of that year, the two branches of liberalism, under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, had their clearest confrontation. In the heat of the struggle the partisans of Roosevelt's New Nationalism and Wilson's New Freedom may have over-emphasized their differences rather than their considerable areas of agreement. But few at the time doubted that they were disputing over more than the means of controlling trusts; they felt themselves to be contending over fundamentally divergent philosophies of government.[15]

From the perspective of the present, Wilson achieved something of a Pyrrhic victory in 1912. The realities of power and the demands of the war forced Wilson, as Arthur Schlesinger Jr. has written, to "Nationalize the New Freedom." As victor, Wilson found himself adopting and enacting much of the centralist program of the loser. He found it necessary - as Herbert Croly had proposed - to use Hamiltonian means for his Jeffersonian ends.[16]

In the election of 1912, the liberal journalists with whom we are concerned agreed on one thing: both the editors of the Nation and the men who were soon to found the New Republic rejected any thought of supporting the conservative Republicans under Taft. The Nation, edited by the classicist, Paul Elmer More, supported

Wilson as the most consistent representative of nineteenth-century Jeffersonian liberalism. The New Republic group, including Herbert Croly, Walter Lippmann, Walter Weyl and Willard Straight (the journal's financial "angel"), backed Roosevelt and his Progressive Party.[17]

Thus one develops a picture of the distinction between the old and new liberalisms which is almost too neat: the nineteenth century vs. the twentieth; Jeffersonian individualism vs. Hamiltonian Nationalism; Wilson vs. Roosevelt; and - in journalism - the Nation vs. the emerging New Republic. But, however they may over-simplify the situation, these labels do serve to identify the divergent trends within the liberal movement.

The journals themselves complicated the definitional problem considerably. The New Republic, during the period from 1914-1916, preferred to call itself "progressive." But when the editors began to shift to the support of Wilson, they took his "liberal" tag unto themselves, and dropped "progressive" as perhaps too reminiscent of their atrophied allegiance to Roosevelt.[18] The Nation, meanwhile, under the editorship of Harold Fuller (who succeeded More in 1914) managed to support both Wilson and the New Freedom policies which Wilson was realistically modifying and in some respects abandoning.

In early 1918, however, Fuller resigned, and Oswald Garrison Villard took over the active direction of the Nation. Villard abandoned the individualistic laissez-faire policies of his predecessors and soon made the journal into a vigorous advocate of the new liberalism.[19] It is evident, then, that as Forcey has

pointed out, a shift of opinion did take place at the "crossroads of liberalism" in the Progressive era. Exponents of Jeffersonian liberalism like Wilson found it necessary to use the positive state to achieve their ends. And in journalism, the Nation took an analogous turn to the left and found itself occupying a position much like that of the New Republic.

This historical exploration of liberalism and its two chief branches in the Progressive period permits a more systematic consideration of the three claims made above; that the Nation and the New Republic have been the most influential liberal journals since 1914, that they have had the most consistent publishing histories of any such periodicals, and that they have generally represented the broad consensus of American liberalism in this period.

In considering the influence of these journals, one must also justify the pairing of them in such an investigation. Students of journalism generally agree that the Nation and the New Republic should be considered jointly. Beulah Amidon wrote in 1940 that

> Most of us think and speak of them together - the Nation and the New Republic. Even to those who know them only by name, it seems natural to bracket the two weeklies, vehicles of liberal opinion, commentators on the current scene.

Amidon noted that the two journals had a certain "together-ness" very early, and that after World War I they had been "among the first to voice the disillusionment and outrage of forward-looking Americans."[20] Forcey has written that at the time of the founding of the New Republic, the Nation was its "closest domestic model." And James Wood refers to the New Republic as the "companion liberal magazine" of the Nation.[21]

Clearly, there is considerable justification for joint consideration of the two magazines. But what of their influence? It is, of course, extremely difficult to measure the impact of any periodical upon the public mind. But historians and journalists have testified that, in spite of their relatively small circulations, these two magazines have been among the most influential molders of American liberal thought. Morison and Commager have written that upon its founding, the New Republic "assumed at once a commanding position in directing the political, social and economic thought of the country along liberal channels." Sidney Kaplan has described its editor, Herbert Croly, as "the most influential moderate-liberal thinker of his day." And Charles Forcey has recorded one cause of this influence - that the New Republic developed a reputation (not completely deserved) as an official spokesman first for Roosevelt, and then for Wilson.[22]

The Nation, under Fuller's editorship (1914-1918) was clearly not the journalistic force it had been during the post-Civil War period under Godkin. It had continued to represent the old bourgeois liberalism which Croly now called "a species of higher conservatism."[23] But among its readers were many of the teachers, professors, editors, ministers and other opinion-makers of the day. And after Villard took over direction of the magazine in 1918, its circulation and influence both increased markedly.[24]

At the end of the 1930's, Thurman Arnold wrote: "I have read the New Republic and the Nation consistently . . . I can tell what my liberal colleagues are going to say tomorrow by reading articles in these two publications today." He added

that "in this country periodical literature has been more important than books and there have been more new notions put across by these two publications than by any other two in the history of American letters."[25] Arnold's words apply with equal force to the period included in this study. That these journals have been influential, there can be little doubt. But what was the nature of that influence? It is unlikely that such journals converted many from conservatism to liberalism; few would read them unless they already had liberal leanings. An analogy to John Dewey may help to explain the situation. J. Allen Smith once wrote, "We were all Deweyites before we read Dewey." And Henry May has observed that "Dewey was immensely influential on people who basically agreed with him."[26] A similar pattern prevailed in the case of subscribers to these journals: because of their liberal interests they read the Nation and the New Republic. No doubt they enjoyed the reinforcement of their ideas which they found there. But it is more than likely that the magazines also extended, guided and shaped those ideas. People of liberal persuasion read the journals as a means of exploring the implications of their general philosophies. The magazines helped them to transform their liberal attitudes into specific positions on various issues.

The second reason given for dependence on the Nation and the New Republic in this study is that these two weeklies have more consistent publishing histories than similar magazines. The Nation has now appeared each week for 118 years, and the New Republic for 69. But during the period since 1914 a number of

other left-of-center periodicals have come and gone. The Progressive magazine is one of the few of similar antiquity. It was published from 1909 to 1929 as La Follette's Magazine and later revived under its present name. Unlike the Nation and the New Republic, however, it is a monthly and it has never achieved either the circulation or influence of the other two journals.

Another leftist magazine, the Masses, has had occasional periods of importance during its tortuously complicated history. It first appeared in 1911 as a vigorous exponent of pacifism and socialism. It expired in 1917, was revived as Liberator in 1918, and was taken over by the Communist Party in 1924. It underwent a second rebirth in 1926 as the New Masses and a third in 1948 as Masses and Mainstream.[27]

During part of the period under study here, the Seven Arts had a considerable impact on the more esthetically-oriented young radicals. Although it was published only during 1916 and 1917, its editors - including Randolph Bourne and Van Wyck Brooks - made it a powerful voice among intellectuals. During this period the Dial also carried articles by Bourne, Thorstein Veblen and other advanced thinkers.[28]

Amidst all the journalistic confusion described above, the Nation and the New Republic continued on their relatively consistent courses, undergoing normal changes in their ownership and staffs, making occasional shifts in editorial policy, but maintaining throughout a degree of continuity not evident in the history of other liberal journals.[29]

The third claim made for these journals is that they have

represented, for the most part, the broad consensus of American intellectual liberalism. Although they have changed their positions at various times, they have not strayed from the rather wide boundaries of the liberal reservation. Their general stance might be described as non-doctrinaire pragmatic liberalism. Such a position excludes Marxism and other brands of ideological radicalism as represented by the New Masses. It excludes the non-reformist iconoclasm of the early American Mercury variety. And it obviously excludes the stand-pattism of popular news magazines such as Time and Newsweek.

The very survival of the New Republic and the Nation over an extended period may be taken as evidence that they have managed to express (and probably to mold) some of the underlying beliefs of American liberalism. They have avoided becoming irrevocably committed to particular liberal programs or leaders, although the New Republic had close calls with Roosevelt and Wilson.[30]

Gentry, in his study of the New Republic, writes that the word " 'liberal' is fairly well understood today to identify a person who wishes to use the powers of the government to aid or guarantee the welfare of the public, while holding to the older concern for the civil rights of the individual."[31] We may accept this as a working definition of the new liberalism represented since 1914 by the New Republic and since 1918 by the Nation. This is a narrow enough definition to exclude conservatism and doctrinaire radicalism, and yet broad enough to leave room for the continual arguments which the liberals enjoy carrying on among themselves. This liberalism occupies, in short, what Lippmann

has called the middle ground "between Manchester and Marx."[32]

This study deals with the period from 1914 through 1921. The starting date was set at 1914 primarily because in that year the New Republic began publication. It is convenient also in that during the same year Harold Fuller took over the direction of the Nation from Paul Elmer More.[33] In the world beyond journalism, 1914 saw in America the high water mark of the Progressive movement, and, in Europe, the outbreak of World War I.

During the 1914-1921 period the journals were particularly concerned with the efficiency movement in education, with academic freedom, and with the role of the schools in social reform.

In considering these topics, we shall try to determine elements both of continuity and of change in the educational interests of the journals. We shall also point out some of the ways in which journal personnel actively involved themselves in various educational activities and ventures. Finally, we shall analyze the general relationships between liberal journals and educational developments, with particular attention to the role assumed by the Nation and the New Republic as critics of american education.

II. Liberalism, Old and New

The seven years from 1914 to 1921 were eventful ones for American liberals. Just as they saw, in 1914, their hopes for progress crest in a flurry of reformist legislation, they also saw their yearnings for peace dashed with the outbreak of war in

Europe.[34] At the end of the period, after a war so destructive that even the "victors" lost, the faded hero Wilson was replaced as president by handsome, inarticulate, ineffectual Warren Harding.

Amidst these great events, the world of education went on about its business of training the young. But change was the order of the day in the world of the schools and colleges as well as in the world outside. Progressive education was gaining adherents, scientific management was beginning to penetrate school practices, academic freedoms were coming under severe attack, and reformers were calling on the schools as allies in their fight for justice and progress. And the Nation and the New Republic, while giving the bulk of their attention to international and domestic politics, commented extensively also on education as well as on literature, art and other less political matters.

In analyzing the response of the liberal journals to educational developments during this period, one must be necessarily selective. It would be unwieldy and fruitless to attempt to catalogue and classify journal reaction to all the specific educational "events" of these years. Instead, one major and three minor hypotheses are set forth. Evidence bearing on these theses throws light on the overall relationship between liberal journalism and education.

The major hypothesis is that the "old" and "new" liberalisms in politics and economics each had its corollary in educational policy. The three subsidiary hypotheses all provide additional evidence for the above claim. However, each has an emphasis and

a significance of its own as well:

1) Both the Nation and the New Republic were early and vigorous critics of the "cult of efficiency" in the schools. Both opposed - at first for somewhat different reasons - the permeation of business-oriented scientific management practices into educational concerns.

2) The liberal journals were - as one would expect - staunch defenders of academic freedom at all levels of education. However, the pre-1918 Nation took a quite different stand from the New Republic and the post-1918 Nation on the means required for the defense of such freedoms.

3) Both the old and new liberalisms were reformist, and both made a place for education in their agenda for reform. But they differed significantly on the elements of a reformist program and on the kind of education required for the advancement of that program.

The basic postulate of this study is that the "old" and "new" liberalisms which co-existed in the late Progressive period each had its distinctive educational point of view. Or, to put the matter more broadly, each of the two branches which diverged at the "crossroads of liberalism" had a general philosophy which encompassed educational as well as political, social and economic matters.

Lawrence Cremin has clearly demonstrated that in some respects the progressive education movement was the pedagogical equivalent of political progressivism. But his book, while emphasizing the"pluralistic, frequently contradictory character" of progressive

education itself, gives little emphasis to the deep splits within the broader progressive movement.[35] Cremin thus does not record the existence of a sizable body of political progressives who were clearly out of sympathy with the progressive trend in education. The Nation, from 1914-1918, represented just such a group.

One could solve this problem, of course, by defining progressivism or liberalism so as to exclude those for whom journals like the Nation were speaking, but such a move would be quite unsound. The Nation supported Wilson in both of his presidential campaigns; it consistently backed the administrative reforms so dear to the hearts of middle-class progressives; it saw itself as an organ of moderate, respectable reform. The progressive movement - like most political movements - was broad enough to include a rather wide range of opinion. It seems quite appropriate to identify Fuller's Nation as a spokesman for the right wing of progressivism and Croly's New Republic as a spokesman for the left.[36]

As was noted above, Rush Welter has analyzed the educational views of "old liberals" of the Godkin type and of "new liberals" like Croly and Lippmann. But he has not recorded the fact that much of the older liberalism, somewhat refurbished, was still expressing opinions on education and democracy during the Progressive era.[37] Thus there clearly is room for further research and interpretation in this area. A survey of articles, editorials and reviews in the Nation and the New Republic suggests two propositions:

1) Between 1914 and 1918, while Harold Fuller was editor, the Nation represented the "New Freedom" variety of Jeffersonian liberalism; at the same time, its position on educational matters was less reformist, more traditional and more individualistic than that of the New Republic.

2) After early 1919, when O.G. Villard moved the Nation politically to the left, it took a position on education similar to that held by the New Republic: more reformist, more sympathetic to the emerging "new education," more concerned about the social utility of education.

The editors of the New Republic were pragmatic liberals, who wanted to see education - along with other institutions - used as an agent of social reconstruction.[38] The pre-1918 Nation also saw itself as a reformist journal, but it saw reform largely in terms of restoration. It feared that progressive education would weaken traditional values and cast doubts upon the ability of "practical" education to preserve the higher things in life. Another clear difference between the two journals during this period was in the greater attention which the Nation gave to higher education. It saw the colleges as bastions for the defense of culture and tended to ignore the lower schools or to contemplate their activities with misgivings.

The contrast between the two journals in this period is clearly evident in their reviews of two of Dewey's books - Schools of Tomorrow (written with his daughter Evelyn), published in 1915, and Democracy and Education, which appeared in 1916. The New

Republic's review of Schools of Tomorrow applauded the Deweys' unashamed use of ideas and quotations from Rousseau. It declared that they had updated Rousseau's "old vision . . . of having each child unfold his or her powers and tastes, gripping and adjusting the world to him, and himself to the world." The book gave the reviewer the hope that such a vision might now be realized, not only in private schools, but - through such approaches as the Gary plan - in schools serving the broad public as well.[39]

The Nation's review of Schools of Tomorrow was - characteristically - more lengthy, scholarly, and critical than that carried by the New Republic. While the reviewer did not completely reject the purposes of the new education described in the book, he entered several fundamental warnings about it:

1) He noted that education which emphasized practicality could easily "descend to the dead level of materialism."

2) He expressed the fear that too rapid educational change might "endanger the cultural training which our high schools are giving."

3) He questioned the attempt in the Gary Schools to convince students of the utility of all subject matter:

> All education should be practical in the sense that it should fit into a useful scheme of the universe; but the use of some portions of it need not necessarily be felt by students until long after they have left school.

4) He admitted that aspects of the new education might be effective in the hands of imaginative teachers but the average, more prosaic teacher would "deal almost exclusively in the material," and neglect the connection of the material and the mental which

Dewey proposed.[40]

The following year Democracy and Education, Dewey's educational magnum opus, appeared, and the two journals gave it treatment comparable to that of the earlier book.[41] Walter Lippmann's brief review in the New Republic was adulatory, and even included an unorthodox note of praise for Dewey's "tightly packed and organized" style. Lippmann was impressed by Dewey's sense of the social role of the school and by his grasp of the historical changes which had affected that role. He shared Dewey's antipathy to the traditional school

> inherited from a society in which there was a sharp division of social classes, in which culture was the property of leisure and drudgery the fate of ordinary men, in which commands came from on high, that is, from God through the rich, in which obedience was a greater virtue than self-direction . . . and science had not yet come to break down exclusiveness and offer endless hope to mankind.

Lippmann welcomed Democracy and Education as a force in the creation of a new school for a new society: "It is a great book because it expresses more deeply and more comprehensively than any other that could be named the best hope of liberal men."[42]

The Nation's review of Democracy and Education was not unfriendly, but it lacked the enthusiastic, uncritical tone of Lippmann's. Among other things, the reviewer, Warner Fite, questioned Dewey's dialectical pattern of thought: "Perhaps it is wrong to expect a pragmatic philosopher to 'stand' anywhere. His business is rather to move." Fite noted Dewey's effort to balance the various dualisms with which he was working - the individual and society, culture and utility, discipline and

interest - but felt that he tended to emphasize the second item in each pair. This, to Fite, was an outgrowth of the " 'social' obsession which underlies all of Professor Dewey's thinking."[43]

The contrast between the two reviews is clear. Lippmann accepted Dewey's social and educational program in full; it appealed to him as a reformer - as one eager to cast off the dead hand of the past and to build a more just and creative future. It appealed also to Lippmann's faith that science - as he had declared two years earlier in Drift and Mastery - might be the "modern communion" which would bind men together in their struggle for a better life.[44]

The Nation's reviewer, on the other hand, instead of welcoming Dewey as an ally, saw him partly as a potential threat. Dewey's philosophy questioned the emphasis of most existing education upon individualism, culture and discipline. It proposed to infuse into the schools a greater stress on social goals and activities and emphasized student interest rather than the disciplinary value of content. In short, while Lippmann saw Dewey as the prophet of a better social order, the Nation's reviewer feared him as the leader of a serious assault upon established values. It is no exaggeration to say that Lippmann evaluated Dewey with the eyes of the future and the Nation with the eyes of the past.

The January 31, 1918 issue of the Nation carried the announcement that Harold Fuller had resigned as editor, and that Oswald Garrison Villard would now assume responsibility for the magazine. The shift from Fuller to Villard represented a move from the old to the new liberalism, although it was immediately instigated by

the fact that Fuller had been outspokenly pro-Allied, while Villard insisted on maintaining a pacifist position concerning the European conflict. The Nation's leftward shift helped attract many new readers, and was apparently welcome to some of the old subscribers as well. A "reader's-eye-view" of the change was given in a letter which the journal carried in early 1919:

> Nowadays on opening one's Nation each week one is conscious of an expectation which did not exist a few months ago . . .
> No longer do we read academic discussions on such dessicated subjects as the split infinitive in Shakespeare. A growing interest in and toleration of so-called radicalism has become obvious to the most casual reader, until we find open sympathy for, if not espousal of, advanced Socialism, Anarchism and even Bolshevism - and the end is not yet.
> That that is happening to the Nation is evidently that which is transforming many of us as individuals. We are becoming aware that we are to live in a world of new conditions, one in which the old order not only changeth but may well disappear altogether.[45]

The changed editorial policy encompassed education along with other domestic concerns. Writers and reviewers placed less emphasis on traditional cultural values and mental discipline and more on the social and reformist role of education. They became increasingly vigorous in their attack on business domination of schools and colleges. They spoke out for strong teachers' organizations. In short, they moved closer to the "new liberal" position already held by Dewey and his allies on the New Republic.

In fact, a more favorable attitude to Deweyan pragmatism was one of the more noticeable changes in the "new" Nation. Where the reviews of Dewey's earlier books had been somewhat suspicious and critical, the review of his Reconstruction in Philosophy which

appeared in late 1920 was entirely positive. The fact that Boyd Bode, a pragmatist whose work and ideas, according to Cremin, "closely resembled the spirit and temper of Dewey's" was asked to review the book, was itself indicative of the change in the Nation.[46]

Boyd saw the book as the "most comprehensive and enlightening pragmatic document that has yet appeared." He agreed with Dewey's claim that philosophy had historically been a conservative force and that science could help to liberate philosophy as it had other fields. He saw pragmatism as a "tool or an instrument for the reorganization of experience, not an explication of a pre-existent reality."

Boyd concluded with the statement that

> . . . the book is a masterpiece. It formulates and applies, with splendid insight, an outlook upon life that represents one of the potent social forces of the present time. It is in itself a reconstruction in philosophy, and it is a powerful plea to philosophy to forsake its sterile practices and become in a significant sense a guide of life.[47]

Articles and reviews of this nature indicated that Villard's Nation, as a spokesman of the new liberalism, was sympathetic with the pragmatic philosophy which underlay the new education.[48] It was equally sympathetic with educational experiments which grew out of that democratic, pragmatic point of view. In early 1918 preliminary plans for the New School for Social Research were released. A Nation editorial, written by H. R. Mussey, praised the founders for their vision of an educational institution based on freedom and creativity, which minimized administration, and which liberated students from rigid curricular boundaries. Mussey

hoped that such an institution might fulfill a function not met by business-dominated universities, which "have difficulty providing the surroundings in which the frank discussion of existing social conditions with a view to their radical reconstruction, if necessary, can be easily carried on."[49]

As plans for the New School were formulated, the Nation continued to applaud the proposal. An article by James Harvey Robinson, one of the founders of the school, described the new venture as a response to the problems of social reconstruction created or exposed by the war. Robinson hoped that the institution might help to bridge the yawning gulf which existed between theory and practice in the social sciences. In a Deweyan reconciliation of dualisms, he declared that "all intelligent practice is based on theory, and all theories that are calculated to aid in reform are nothing but broad and critical ways of viewing practice."[50]

Further evidence on this question is given below in those sections of the paper dealing with efficiency, academic freedom and reformism in education. But it should be clear at this point that the progressive movement had its right and left wings, represented in journalism by the pre-1918 Nation and by the New Republic; that there were clear and consistent differences in the educational policies of the two journals during that period; and that under a "new liberal" editor after 1918, the Nation adopted a position on education similar to that already taken by its fellow journal.

III. Efficiency and Education

During the period under study, the Nation and the New Republic were consistently hostile to the domination of the schools by business ideologies and values. The journals evidenced this hostility in a number of ways, but it can be explored most meaningfully in their attitudes toward the application of business efficiency to educational concerns.[51]

The relationships of these two journals to American business and its generally conservative outlook were complex, ambiguous and changing. At the beginning of this period, in spite of their differences, both were organs of middle-class reform; neither sought an alliance with the proletariat against the rest of society. The founders of the New Republic - whose magazine was subsidized by Willard Straight, a representative of the Morgan interests - had in their books expressed an inordinate faith that enlightened businessmen might "civilize the whole class conflict."[52]

Yet in spite of their hope that businessmen might become the agents of social transformation, the New Republic editors were more than a bit suspicious of the existing influence of business. They lost no opportunity to denounce the conservative role of businessmen in the affairs of the nation,including the schools. As Forcey has pointed out, Croly, Weyl and Lippmann as editors were soon putting their faith in industrial democracy rather than relying on businessmen as the agents of social change.[53]

Thus, almost from the beginning of its history, the New Republic opposed business conservatism from the left. The

Nation's early opposition to the business ideology, however, might be said to come neither from the left nor the right, but from above. It requires no stretch of the historical imagination to see the pre-1918 Nation in terms of Richard Hofstadter's "status revolution."[54] Under Harold Fuller (and Paul Elmer More before him), the Nation looked down on the new business leadership and continually sniped at the shoddy values displayed by that leadership. The Nation, as Henry May has shown, was a representative of the "genteel tradition";[55] as such, it resisted the encroachment of philistine "progress" in many areas of life, including education.

Both journals were thus suspicious of the "pecuniary interests," although on the basis of somewhat different outlooks. Their attitudes toward business were expressed in articles and editorials on a variety of subjects and were clearly evident in discussions of efficiency and education.

In the case of the New Republic there was a complicating factor. Croly, Weyl and Lippmann came to their journalistic endeavors with considerable admiration for raw efficiency - for efficiency not tied to a conservative social program. Like many other progressives, they were interested in scientific government, scientific conservation, scientific labor relations and in other applications of science and efficiency practices.[56] The New Republic was thus in a position to support efficiency as a means, but to reject many of the conservative ends to which businessmen tried to apply it. The Nation also saw clearly that efficiency could not stand as a social goal, but it was also almost automatically suspicious of efficiency in itself. The whole efficiency

package represented elements of a new industrial society which the Nation could not quite accept. The important point is that both journals - although approaching the problem from different directions - reached similar conclusions regarding efficiency practices in education.

The New Republic's position on efficiency in education was the corollary of its policy on efficiency in industry. That policy was made clear in a 1916 editorial which reported on a meeting of the Taylor Society, and which concluded that "our greatest need in America today is a working agreement between democracy and science." The problem even entered political discussions, with Hughes in the 1916 campaign accusing the Democratic administration of gross inefficiency. Lippmann, however, stated his preference for Wilson, and declared that "efficiency will never be a popular cause in America until it is tied securely to radical liberalism."[57]

As was noted earlier, Randolph Bourne, in the very first article on education carried by the New Republic, criticized - albeit somewhat obliquely - the penetration of efficiency practices into the schools. He had struck a theme which he would continually express in his educational writings. In 1916 he put the matter in some perspective, separating efficient means from human goals:

> A school system whose object was little more than to abolish illiteracy and prepare the more fortunate for college was bound to fall an easy prey to the mechanical organizer . . . The machinery was developed before the moving ideals were worked out . . . It is so easy to forget that this tightening of the machinery is only in order that the product may be finer and richer . . . To institutionalize a social function is always the line of least resistance.[58]

But it is in Bourne's articles on the "Gary Plan" that one sees most clearly the "new liberal's" attitude towards efficiency and education. In 1915 Bourne wrote a series of five New Republic articles about Superintendent William Wirt's educational innovations in Gary, Indiana. Bourne visited the Gary schools, and was impressed by their democratic spirit, by the enthusiasm with which the students participated in the work, and by the numerous connections established between the life of the school and that of the community outside.

The Gary Schools had been cited as an example of the application of scientific management to education, but Bourne saw them in quite a different light.[59] He reported Wirt's belief that the public was unlikely to increase its investment in education and that the only hope for improvement was the more intensive use of educational resources. But Bourne declared that this change had been undertaken "with none of the spirit of the 'efficiency expert' or mechanical administrator." He could not agree with some critics that the Gary schools were the educational analogues of the new steel industry that was burgeoning in Gary. On the contrary:

> That these schools /challenge/ in their democratic organization and opportunity, their versatility and joy of initiative, most of the ideas and principles upon which enterprises like those of Judge Gary's have been founded, is one of those ironical accidents which will happen.[60]

Bourne returned to this theme in his second article, declaring that "Mr. Wirt has been accused of 'business efficiency,' but this

is scarcely the term for so artistically elegant a scheme of economy . . . Such economy is creative; it enriches, not impoverishes."[61] In fact, one of the major themes of Bourne's articles was that the Gary schools had succeeded in freeing teachers and students from old lock-step mechanical educational procedures.

As Bourne observed later, these articles constituted a "mere impressionistic survey" of Wirt's educational innovations.[62] He seems to have spent most of his time visiting classrooms and relatively little exploring the administrative intricacies of the system. Had he done so, he might have seen more clearly, and warned against, the incipient tendencies towards conservative, business-oriented, economy-emphasizing efficiency which were to become the target of later liberal critics.

But the important point for our purpose is not, of course, whether Bourne was correct in his assertion that the Gary schools were free of negative efficiency practices. The significant thing to note is that Bourne in these articles expressed unremitting hostility to mechanical efficiency approaches to educational and human concerns. Part of his favorable response to the Gary schools was based precisely on his belief that they were free of such life-destroying influences.[63]

John Dewey, in a 1918 review of Helen Marot's Creative Industry, added his authority to the conviction expressed by the editors and by Bourne, that scientific efficiency must be

accompanied by democracy in education, industry and all areas of life. He noted that "even the movement for 'scientific management' got no further in its psychology than the importance of standardizing methods of production; it never perceived the importance of enlisting the cooperation of the workers in discovering and fixing these standards for themselves."[64]

While New Republic writers were attacking efficiency which was not based on democracy, the Nation originally assailed it as part of the new educational trend which was leading to an excess of democracy. In 1916, a Nation editorial commented on the program which had been issued for the annual convention of the National Education Ass ation. The teachers were being offered a number of meetings w h revolved around the current mania for efficiency. The editors noted that efficiency was becoming the "watchword of public education," but that if education became too standardized and mechanized, "such efficiency was no better than a steamroller."

The editors observed the general - but only partly laudable - identification of democracy and efficiency; of the effort to democratize opportunity by making people equally efficient in earning a living and in carrying on the other activities of life. But the editors seemed to fear that the schools might become too efficient in this area; that the very success of the school tended to "relieve parents of all sense of responsibility in the instruction of their children. The more the schools undertake, the more the parents shirk. The result is bound to be a levelling of minds and manners."

What the editors were objecting to, of course, was the assumption by the school of a wider variety of social functions; of its development as a legatee institution. And it was in these terms that they saw the efficiency movement; it was part of a whole trend - which they rejected - away from cultural education and toward vocational, practical, materialistic training.

The Nation also feared the effects of the efficiency movement on instructors. In this same editorial, they questioned the adoption of mechanical methods and procedures which would inhibit the "character and originality of the individual teacher."[65] And two years earlier they had given Columbia's President Butler a rare note of praise for opposing "the foolish and wrong-headed proposal of applying to the teaching body of a university the mechanical tests of the efficiency engineer."

But if efficiency practices were deadening for teachers, they were even more so for students - who were, after all, the chief concern of the whole educational process. Thus the editors found it necessary to also condemn Butler for his proposal that physical examinations be required of Columbia entrants. They saw such a plan as the expression of an over-riding and misdirected "itch for perfection." In regard to his professors, Butler had written, "A university is precluded from being efficient in the mechanical or business sense by its essential character and essential policies." The Nation added: "Most true - and applicable just as truly to the spirit in which the university should regard its body of students as to that in which it should view questions of faculty organization."[66]

While the pre-1918 Nation had questioned efficiency in education primarily because of its apparent connection with vocational studies, the growth of the school's functions, and with "extreme democracy,"[67] the journal under Villard took a position more like that of the New Republic. The similarities of the post-1918 stands of the journals on the related questions of efficiency, the influence of business on education, and the social role of education were evident in the journals' reviews of Thorstein Veblen's Higher Learning in America. The New Republic review, written by Harold Laski, quoted Veblen's charge that "the University apes the great business organization. It lays emphasis upon its quantitative output - the number of its students, the writing in bulk of its professors."

Like Veblen, Laski deplored the conservative effect of the business domination which created this atmosphere: "In every subject that nearly touches the business world, heterodoxy is at a discount." And Laski shared Veblen's conviction that university control by trustees had to be abolished if the institutions were to be free to pursue their truly creative functions. But, although Laski saw The Higher Learning in America as "the profoundest analysis that has been made of the weaknesses of the American university system," he could not accept Veblen's non-reformist conclusions. Laski insisted that the university could not "decry utilitarian pursuits; for the simple and satisfactory reason that its main business is the service of man. Mr. Veblen's own hypothesis is open to the danger which follows every worshipper of research for its own sake; he takes his laboratory and calls it

life."[68]

The Nation's reviewer, Joseph Jastrow, was also generally positive in his reaction to The Higher Learning in America. Jastrow agreed with Veblen that "business success is by common consent, and quite uncritically, taken to be conclusive evidence in matters that have no relation to education." He summarized Veblen's observations on efficiency in education: "Every item of the mechanism of teaching must be standardized and made to tell a statistical tale, which alone falls within the comprehension of the laity."

Veblen had criticized the colleges for treating their faculties as employees, and Jastrow agreed with him that the professors were partly to blame for permitting this business-oriented practice to develop.

> Unquestionably, the commercializing - even admitting its inevitability in some measure - has been hastened and aggravated by the false spirit of concession, even the warm adoption of the programme, which the academy should have resisted wisely and vigorously and well.

Jastrow's only major criticism of the book was precisely that made by Laski in the New Republic: Veblen assumed that "the scholar desires to be or should be nothing more than a scholar." Where Veblen sought to conceal his moralism and humanitarianism behind a screen of disinterested scholarship, Jastrow explicitly advocated a sense of social concern and an assumption by university personnel of responsibility for human betterment.[69]

These reviews point up the interesting relationship of Veblen to the representatives of the "new liberalism." The liberal

journals, in their usual eclectic fashion, accepted much of Veblen's argument while rejecting some of the illiberal conclusions to which he came. They welcomed him as an ally in the denunciation of the pecuniary control of science and technoloty, but while Veblen sought to substitute control by technicians, the liberal journals followed Dewey in demanding greater democratic control.[70]

Certainly men like Dewey had more in common intellectually with scientists than with businessmen; but such liberals opposed the granting of inordinate power to any group. Thus they opposed Veblen's putatively socially-disinterested role for higher education. They rejected his position that research should take place in a social and moral vacuum; instead, they insisted that research and education must be dedicated to human welfare. And that welfare could not be promoted either by the old commercial-industrial oligarchy or the new scientific-technical elitism.[71]

The journals' positions on efficiency and education may be seen most clearly within this broad context. Both the Nation and the New Republic consistently recognized the need for rational economy measures in schools, but joined in deploring the use of the efficiency fad as a means of lowering necessary educational expenditures.

But the Nation under Fuller associated efficiency with vocational, practical and hyper-democratic trends in the schools and condemned the entire package; the New Republic, on the other hand, resisted efficiency measures primarily because they were closely tied to business-oriented conservatism. And under Villard, the Nation came to share the "new liberal" position of its sister

journal - that science and efficiency were only creative to the extent that they were accompanied by an extension of democracy.

IV. Scholars and Their Bosses[72]

Throughout the period under study, both the Nation and the New Republic were consistent defenders of academic freedom at all levels of education. This position is so predictable that it would hardly warrant consideration, were it not for one important fact: During the years 1914-1921 there was a clear distinction between the means proposed by the "old liberal," Fuller, and the "new liberal," Villard, for the defense and extension of academic freedom. Under Fuller, although the Nation deplored attacks on teachers and professors, it offered little more than ringing prose in defense of their rights. But under Villard, the Nation joined the New Republic in promoting organizations and unions as instruments of self-defense for teachers. In short, the new liberalism added power to persuasion in the promotion of academic freedom.

Actually, the magazines often considered together two related but separable issues - academic freedom and the system of school and university government. Since violations of academic freedom were usually committed by trustees or by administrators acting as their agents, the journals often used the same editorials to defend individual instructors and to attack the existing pattern of school and university control.

The contrast between the journals on this issue during the pre-1918 period was evident in their handling of the formation of the American Association of University Professors in early 1915. The

Nation carried a bland, detailed report on the organizational meetings by Morris Jastrow, one of the participants. Jastrow noted the group's decision to exclude college presidents from membership, but handled this largely as a technical issue. Similar treatment was accorded to the discussions of tenure and academic ranking. But singularly lacking in his report was attention to the social context of these matters or the academic dissatisfaction which lay behind the formation of the group.[73]

The New Republic, however, was more familiar with the various forces and pressures which had led to the new organization. Two years earlier, Herbert Croly had been the only non-professor to serve on an academic freedom committee formed by several learned societies. John Dewey and Alvin Johnson, both New Republic contributors and later editorial board members, were among the founders of the A.A.U.P.[74] It is not surprising, then, that the New Republic saw the new organization in greater social perspective. The editors ignored the technicalities of the situation and commented on the central issue involved, concluding as follows:

> Several of the speakers seemed to be morbidly afraid that the association might be popularly misconceived as a labor union. Almost they did protest too much. A union of professors must differ essentially from a union of wage-earners, but the new association is seeking none the less an object analogous to that of an ordinary union. It is seeking increasing independence for its members by means of organization and community of spirit.[75]

During Fuller's editorship, the Nation, while deploring the violations of academic freedom, gave little attention to the vulnerability of professors and teachers or to the need for

collective action on their part. Consistent with its moralistic, individualistic world-view, the journal seemed to hope that the offending school boards and trustees could be persuaded to deal more justly with their faculties and to take their social responsibilities more seriously. Not atypical (though more vigorously expressed than usual) was the Nation's comment on the dismissal of Scott Nearing by the University of Pennsylvania trustees. It declared that the "idea that . . . the trustees are not accountable to anybody but themselves for the spirit in which the institution is conducted, is one that will have to be pried out of these gentlemen's heads."[76]

But while the Nation looked to persuasion as a means of progress in this area, the New Republic unequivocally supported collective action by educators as well as representation of teachers and professors on school and university boards. In early 1915, the journal carried an article by F. I. Davenport which criticized the existing system of non-professional, local control of schools. The author proposed that teachers cease to look upon themselves as employees and gain representation on school boards. But a major difficulty in such a program was that teachers had been too effectively "drilled in reverence for properly constituted authority," and were thus unwilling to assume responsibility.[77]

The New Republic assumed the task of undermining this sense of reverence for authority and of promoting more collective action by educators. In an editorial in July 1915, the journal called

for greater public and faculty representation on university governing boards. It admitted that the existing pattern of control might have been tolerable when boards of trustees were top-heavy with ministers. "But with the passing of control from the ghostly to the moneyed element, the gulf between trustee and professor has become extreme." It hoped that a peaceful sharing of power might take place, but had suggestions for faculty action in the likely event that this did not occur:

> Trustees who really envisage the modern university as a public service, as a body of scientific and sociological experts, will gladly share their power. If they do not, they will demonstrate how radically their own conception of a university differs from the general one, and it will be the duty of professors to assert their rights by all those forms of collective organization whereby controlled classes from the beginning of time have made their ideas effective.[78]

After Villard became its editor in 1918, the Nation joined the New Republic in recommending vigorous collective action by teachers and professors. Two weeks after the Armistice, the Nation responded to the numerous attacks on academic freedom and to attempts to use the schools as instruments of reactionary propaganda by declaring that "the sooner all the teachers organize to protect themselves and rid the schools of politics, the better."[79]

In 1920, the year of the infamous Palmer raids and other assaults on freedom, the Nation's editors registered a firm protest against the action of the Pennsylvania Superintendent of Schools, who had in effect denied teachers the right to join unions. But the journal, having lost faith in the power of pure persuasion to

change the actions of officials and other defenders of the status quo, gave the responsibility to the aggrieved educators: "It will be the fault of the teachers themselves if they go on accepting this 'new freedom,' and allow the disciplinary necessities of an army to determine their rights and duties. We have only one counsel for the teachers of this country: that is to unite to secure the right of free teaching and a proper remuneration for their work."[80]

Partly because of changed conditions, partly because of its new leadership, the Nation had moved a considerable distance from the positions it had taken under More and Fuller. A 1919 editorial contended that the A.A.U.P. had "failed lamentably" to defend academic freedom during the war and praised those professors who were organizing local branches of the American Federation of Teachers. The editors took the occasion to indulge in a rare bit of retrospection: "Of course, such a step has been greeted in some quarters as a sign that Bolshevist principles are invading our institutions of learning, and it is no doubt true that the Nation itself would have been pained and shocked, a dozen years ago, by the news."[81] Now, however, the Nation was greeting the unionizing of professors with enthusiasm, rather than with pain and shock. In this, as in so many other cases, Villard's journal had come around to the more radical and more political position already vigorously expressed by the New Republic.

Three explanations may be given for the positions taken by

the liberal journals during this period on academic freedom and on school and university control.

1) Explanation is required, first of all, for the amount of attention given to these matters. A basic reason, of course, is the fact that the journals were written by and read by intellectuals. The editors and writers were college graduates with more than a passing interest in educational concerns, and the journals' readers also constituted a highly educated group, many of whom were faculty members of schools and colleges.[8] To such men, questions of academic freedom and the government of educational institutions were not subjects of esoteric interest; they were of immediate personal concern.

Furthermore, both journals wanted intellectuals to play larger roles in American society - which they could only do in an atmosphere of freedom. The pre-1918 Nation hoped that college men might help arrest what it saw as a mass drift to narrow practicalism in life. And even when it changed its social goals somewhat under Villard, the Nation clung to its hope that university-trained experts might play a major role in reform.

The New Republic, although more democratic than the early Nation, also hoped that college faculties and graduates might exert an influence out of proportion to their numbers. A 1915 editorial contended that issues of academic freedom and university government were "as vital as any in American life, because the universities are coming more and more to focus the thought of the nation. We depend upon them as upon no other institution to inspire and

discipline the democracy."[83] Thus in the eyes of the editors, the individual interest of faculty members converged with the social interest. Questions of academic freedom and university government were of national as well as personal concern.

2) The above explanations, however, might have held true even had the journals been spokesmen for intellectual conservatism. Liberals and radicals were not the only supporters of academic freedom. But during the latter part of this period, it was the liberals who were under attack, in politics and journalism as well as in schools and colleges. There was thus a community of interest among academic and journalistic liberals. During the war, for example, the Outlook attacked the New Republic as one of America's "public enemies," and included it with the Hearst papers, the German-language press, and the International Workers of the World among the "sappers and miners" in America.[84]

Such attacks came even though the New Republic supported America's participation in the war. The journal had merely exercised its right to be critical of the conduct of the war and of the motives of the allies. But the Nation went further. It opposed American participation in the war and went through a much-publicized clash with government censorship.[85] Such events, continued and intensified during the Red Scare and the Palmer raids, forced liberals to unite in support of their rights. Thus the journals' vigorous fight for academic freedom may he seen also as an effort at self-defense. Attacks on liberals in any field had to be repulsed if liberalism itself was to be safe.

3) There is a third, somewhat broader, explanation for the Nation's and New Republic's positions on academic freedom. Concern for individual freedom was central to the social philosophies of both the old and the new liberalisms. But, as has been noted, the old liberalism placed more emphasis on individualistic means for the promotion of this freedom; the new liberalism recognized that in an increasingly corporate, organized society, collective means were required for individualistic ends.

A corollary of the above was the Nation's shift in emphasis from persuasion to power. During its "old liberal" stage, the Nation had an extravagant faith in the rationality of man, and in the power of intellectuals to convince those in power to act more justly and humanely. But Villard, somewhat chastened by America's experience in World War I, and disillusioned by what he saw as Wilson's false leadership, no longer hoped that those who controlled America's industry and education would willingly acquiesce in a diminution of their powers. Villard was, of course, a pacifist, and he never proposed violence or class conflict as a solution to social or educational problems. But he did join the New Republic in vigorously supporting efforts by suppressed groups - whether educators or laborers - to non-violently and collectively demand and promote their rights.

V. Education and Reform

Lawrence Cremin, in The Transformation of the School, has described three main elements of the progressive education movement:

the scientific, the child-centered, and the reformist.[86] All three of these emphases were present in progressive education in the 1914-1921 period, but it is clear that the liberal journals were primarily interested in promoting a reformist role for the schools. "Reformist," of course, is a term which covers a wide range of policies and programs, including both the mild, genteel brand of progress through persuasion advocated by the pre-1918 Nation as well as the more vigorous, power-oriented reform which it joined the New Republic in supporting after 1918.

Cremin has pointed out also the "inextricable relationships between social reform, reform through education, and the reform of education."[87] An exploration of these relationships - which are particularly evident in the liberal journals - may cast further light on the connections between progressive journalism and progressive education.

Classification and definition in this area are difficult, but perhaps the most appropriate term for the educational position of Fuller's Nation is "pre-progressive." The term "conservative" is too strong, for the Nation did not indulge in unrestrained polemics against new educational developments. It attempted to assess them calmly and moderately, often damning pedagogical innovations with faint praise. It recognized a certain worth in the new education, but consistently expressed the hope that traditional cultural values would not be lost in the new era. And while the pre-1918 Nation rejected much of the emerging educational philosophy and methodology, it maintained an essential

faith in the schools as agents of moderate reform. It did not join in the truly conservative response described by Welter in which some of the more hidebound thinkers "substituted representation for education" in their democratic theory.[88]

The Nation under Fuller saw itself as a reformist journal, but insisted that reform must come under the auspices of benevolent middle-class men like its editors and readers. In fact, writers for the magazine took almost as much pleasure in hurling verbiage at the grubby radicals as at the bloated plutocrats. In 1914, for example, the Nation criticized "social-justice shouters" who had demanded a constitutional amendment for dealing with a problem which was being solved in a more restrained fashion.[89] A similar attitude was expressed a year later in Fuller's review of The Gary Schools:

> The Gary system has been thrust to the fore at a critical period in the history of this country, and the very nicety with which it appears to respond to present tendencies should make one the more suspicious of it as a cure-all. At a time when the excesses of the 'uplift' movement have resulted in a general letting down of the sense of individual responsibility on the part of the victims of economic pressure, Mr. Wirt proposes a plan in which discipline is almost entirely relaxed.[90]

Fuller was expressing here the dilemma which has continually plagued individualistic reformers. While recognizing the seriousness of the problems to which the Gary system was a response, he could not accept the means which were adopted to solve those problems. His hope seemed to be that the old education, improved in some undefined way, might still be adequate in the modern situation. In short, although he had a mild hope that education

might be an instrument of reform, he was not willing to support the reforms within education itself which would have made this possible.

The views expressed by Fuller were reflected in articles and reviews by other Nation writers. A 1915 article by Warner Fite criticized the idea that state universities were more important in a democracy than were private colleges. He saw State institutions of higher education as too utilitarian, while private colleges were essential precisely because of their distance from mundane concerns: "It is mere socialistic nonsense to suppose that an institution which lies outside of the political system performs no 'social function.'"[91]

A 1916 editorial objected to the emphasis laid by educators on "social values," which might "signify an entirely mischievous conception of what a school can attempt - for who shall lightly say what the social values of any community are?" The writer objected to the trend toward "extreme democracy" in education, and concluded that

> at present the schools are, with the best of intentions in the world, in much the same position as the clergyman who, when he might be interpreting Holy Writ, is telling his congregation how they should vote.[92]

There was one area, however, in which Fuller's Nation was more outspoken on reform of and through education. The journal - consistent with its tradition of promoting justice and progress for Blacks - continually called for better educational opportunities

for them.[93] In a statement by Villard, it applauded the work of the General Education Board in raising the standards of Black education but rejected the widely-held view that such education should be simple training for menial vocations. The journal applauded the efforts of those Blacks who - against great odds - acquired a higher education, and insisted that the way should be kept clear for all who had the ambition and ability to follow them.[94]

But even this position, liberal though it was for the time, was not reformist in the broader sense. The Nation's position was that Blacks should have educational opportunity equal to that available for Whites. This was not the same as proposing that education should help to create a new social order. The Nation wanted Blacks to be able to work their way into white society; it was not yet ready to say that the schools might assist in the radical reconstruction of that society.

Thus Fuller's Nation held fast to the older view that education might promote the reform of individuals; that the American economy and polity were basically sound and that the schools should tend to their primary function of producing individuals of worthy character who could work within the system and help to elevate its moral tone. There were in society serious problems of corruption, crime, violence and racial injustice, but these were primarily evidence of weaknesses of character and training in the people who made up society. What was needed was neither a new education nor a new social order, but means of making the old work more effectively.

The New Republic, on the other hand, was dissatisfied not only

with the character and intelligence of individuals, but with the economic, political, and educational system which shaped those individuals. Croly, Weyl and Lippmann saw that modifications in social organization had been made necessary by recent changes in science and industry. They were on the one hand more acceptant than Fuller of the irreversible technological revolution which had taken place; on the other they were less tolerant of the complex of social arrangements left over from an earlier period. They were adherents of the view expressed by Thorstein Veblen that "institutions are products of the past process, are adapted to past circumstances, and are therefore never in full accord with the requirements of the present."[95] Given this inevitable conservative tendency of social institutions, it became the responsibility of liberals to seek environmental as well as individual change.

Thus one finds in the New Republic during this period, more than in the Nation, considerable interest in economic planning, a selective enthusiasm for some aspects of socialism, and a greater warmth towards organized labor. The capitalistic system was not a "given"; it was not an expression of natural law, and men could mold it and modify it as they saw fit. As with the economy, so with the educational system. Recognizing that schools and colleges had a built-in inertia, people should attempt even more vigorously to adjust the content and methods of education in the interest of social welfare.

As was noted above, part of Bourne's enthusiasm for the Gary schools was based on his belief that they provided new institutional patterns, new techniques, and new approaches to content which would help to develop more creative individuals and a more just social

order. The educational views which Bourne expressed were, as he declared, "the product of an enthusiasm for the educational philosophy of John Dewey." And if his articles were sometimes little more than translations and popularizations of Dewey's views, what, he asked, "is a good philosophy for except to paraphrase?"[96]

In an article which the New Republic carried in early 1915, Bourne claimed that Dewey's ideas were profoundly radical; that he was "in the paradoxical situation of a revolutionist with an innate contempt for propaganda." Dewey's philosophy embodied "some of the wisest words ever set to paper." Bourne admired Dewey for bringing order out of social and intellectual chaos. He had demonstrated "the unity of all democratic strivings, the social movement, the new educational ideals, the freer ethics, the popular revolt in politics . . . and the applicability to all of them of scientific method."[97]

But the readers of the New Republic did not receive Dewey's ideas only "in translation." Dewey spoke for himself in over fifty-two articles, notes, letters and reviews which he wrote for the journal between 1914 and 1921.[98] Much of this mass of material, particularly before 1918, dealt directly or incidentally with education. In his articles, Dewey missed few opportunities to promote his view of reform of and through education. He was particularly outspoken in his opposition to attempts to separate vocational and liberal education. In his first New Republic article, he denounced such attempts as part of an effort to make education a prop to an unjust economic system:

> Every ground of public opinion protests against any use of the public school system which takes for granted the perpetuity of the existing industrial regime, and whose inevitable effect is to perpetuate it, with all its antagonisms of employer and employed, producer and consumer.[99]

In an article carried by the journal four months later, Dewey again objected to the idea of dividing the school system into academic and vocational branches. Such proposals were based on the desire of conservative groups to establish a stratified society. If successful, such splits would make it easier for further divisions to occur along religious or national-origins lines, and the schools would lose their role as unifiers of culture.[100] Here, as in his other New Republic articles, Dewey expressed one of his central educational ideas: that the schools should not be passive reflectors of social trends - that they had an obligation to resist and counteract the rigidities and injustices of society, not to reinforce them.

While Bourne and Dewey were calling for reforms within the schools which would enable education to promote desired social changes, Walter Lippmann - as Rush Welter has pointed out - was calling for a more educative politics.[101] Lippmann tried above all to be a realist - to assess correctly man's limited rationality. Yet he joined his interest in charismatic leadership and in the use of myths in guiding social groups with a consistent call for more educational procedures in politics.

Lippmann recognized that the liberal Jeffersonian ideal of

government was no longer viable; that in politics there must be "insiders and outsiders," - leaders and followers. But he blamed the failure of many of the administrative reforms of the progressives on the fact that leaders had failed to enlighten the public properly on the issues: "The power which has educated the insiders has left the outsiders uninformed. So they listen to the largest hope and follow the most magnetic personality."[102]

Throughout his life, Lippmann carried on a dialogue with himself concerning the rationality of man. He moved in his political thought between the positions of elitism and educationalism. But during his association with the New Republic, his emphasis was on the need for an electorate as broadly and as realistically educated as possible. He fully understood the egocentricity of man, the role of the unconscious in motivation, and the public's susceptibility to propaganda, and yet - because he retained a basic faith in the democratic process - persisted in the belief that men could be educated well enough to enable a free society to function.[103]

As in the case of the other issues dealt with in this paper, the Nation under Villard's new leadership came to express a position on education and reform similar to that of the New Republic. After 1918 the Nation ceased to give space to peevish traditionalists who bemoaned the increasing "socialization" of education. Instead there was a growing enthusiasm for such ventures as the New School for Social Research and th Boston Trade Union College.[104] There was encouragement for "th effort to relate the universities more

closely to community needs and of spontaneous movements among the workers themselves for a full educational opportunity." Such educational innovations encouraged the hope that America might "eventually emulate the French in recognizing 'the moral obligation to be intelligent.'"[105]

An editorial note in early 1921 indicated how the various elements of the Nation's new educational outlook could converge. The editors praised a recent convention of the American Federation of Teachers which had adopted a liberal policy on Americanization programs in the schools. The assembled teachers had taken a stand in favor of cultural pluralism; they had rejected the view that Americanization meant discarding the "negative" traits of the immigrants and adopting the Anglo-Saxon characteristics of the "true" American. In their brief statement, the editors demonstrated: (1) their sympathy for a unionized teaching profession; (2) their rejection of a narrow chauvinism as a policy for the schools; and (3) their belief that the schools should function as critics of society. They concluded:

> Whatever demagogues may do, teachers have a more self-respecting task than to praise the country for qualities which it does not possess; it is their obligation to point out the national shortcomings as well as the national virtues.[106]

The editors and contributors of the Nation had clearly come to accept the "new liberal" point of view that the schools should go beyond cultural transmission and engage in the process of cultural transformation. But there was less unanimity concerning the part that education could play in social change. Some

contributors, like Harold Laski, expressed the rather extravagant hope that formal educational institutions might - even in the short run - make the difference between success and failure for society. Laski closed a 1920 article on "British Labor and Direct Action" with the declaration that the Labor Party needed "above all to embark upon a far more extensive educational policy. One gets the sense . . . in England that we are running a race between education and revolution. If labor gives to institutions like the Workingmen's Educational Association the support and funds they deserve, some way out of the present chaos may be found."[107]

In the same year, M.H.Hedges - more disillusioned, perhaps - raised grave doubts about the reforming power of the schools:

> Education is not . . . an extra-social process by which society is constantly freshened and transformed. Rather it lies within society and tends to reproduce in miniature the society which has borne it.

But Hedges was referring to existing educational institutions, which promoted either the Puritan ideal ("celestial propaganda") of Jonathan Edwards or the utilitarian ethic of Benjamin Franklin. He had a hope that these outworn views of education might give way to a pioneering spirit more suited to the modern age. If colleges could begin to "supply students with a sense of a 'total universe of good' that is not fictitious, and to awaken in them the will to act in behalf of that universe," there might be grounds for optimism. But Hedges could not sustain so sanguine a view, and concluded rather dimly that "the chances for the colleges to answer the need of this generation . . . are small."[108]

Hedges may be taken as a convenient exemplar of the educational views of many post-war liberals. The experience of war abroad and reaction at home had deepened the liberal conviction that society was in need of drastic reformation; the hope that education might be an agent of cultural renewal would not die; and yet there was the note of pessimism - the sense that what education should do it actually would not do. It was this sense of pessimism that strengthened the flight of many liberals during the 1920's from politics to aesthetics and of many educators from "reformist" to "child-centered" schools and curricula.[109]

In 1918, the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education issued its influential report, the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Early the following year, the editors of the New Republic published their reaction to the report in an editorial which may be taken as the definitive expression of their position on education and reform in the early post-war period. Characteristically, the editors ascribed to the document a more radically reformist cast than was probably intended by its authors. The editors noted that America had always relied on education as "the chief bulwark of democracy," but that the school had functioned in a largely self-correcting social economy. But society was no longer self-improving, and both conservatives and radicals were demanding that the government assume a greater role in moral and political education in order to keep the social machinery running. This demand implied "both a radical break with the past and a long step toward collectivism in education."[110]

However, conservatives and radicals disagreed on the ideals and methods of education. Conservatives glorified discipline, obedience and an unexamined loyalty to an unquestioned authority. They believed in an "intellectual police power" to keep the people on the "charted paths of virtue and truth." Radicals, on the other hand, emphasized the reform of institutions, not the demand for loyalty: "Social education must . . . start from the idea not only of the decrepitude of the old education but from the gross deficiencies of the affiliated social economy." In this context, the editors cited the recently-enunciated Cardinal Principles as an appropriate ideal for America's educational enterprise, but recorded the sad fact that "our existing educational system fails flagrantly to realize that ideal." In order for the Commission's goals to be achieved, the schools had no choice except to actively accept their roles as legatee institutions. The state should "guarantee to all its citizens through the schools the economic independence which its social economy has failed to guarantee."

Rush Welter has pointed out that in conservative hands such doctrine can make education a substitute for reform rather than an adjunct to it:

> What sophisticated business practice has accomplished, indeed, is to associate the competitive democratic values of Jacksonian and post-Jacksonian liberalism with the modern business system by improving educational opportunities for personal success within it and leading to it. In effect, progressive businessmen have transferred economic individualism from business to the schools and thus reconciled their innovations with traditional American values.[111]

Realistically recognizing that an open educational system might help to preserve a closed economy, conservatives have joined liberals in support of education.

But the liberal editors of the New Republic saw a deeper social role for the schools. They recognized that power was unequally distributed in the American system, and that power - not persuasion - was the key to progress for suppressed groups. Thus the state should "through its schools deliberately confer so far as possible the substance and opportunity of power on all its citizens." By so doing, the government would itself "serve as the chief agency of radical but remedial social change." The editors - after their vigorous presentation of these essentially Deweyan doctrines - closed quite appropriately by letting Dewey speak for himself. The goal of the new educational system would be, in his words, "to produce in schools a projection in type of the society we should like to realize, and by forming minds in accord with it, gradually to modify the larger and more recalcitrant features of adult society."[112]

The school, then, was to be the growing edge of culture. It was not to mirror existing society, nor was it merely to take some of the strain off the existing unjust system and thus enable it to survive. It was - within the limits of its own freedom of action - to mold itself in the image of democratic ideals; it would then be able to produce individuals with enough freedom and power to help move society along in desired directions.

The New Republic had thus kept the liberal faith. In spite

of the war, in spite of the "twilight of idols" such as Roosevelt and Wilson, the editors of the New Republic still had confidence that reform and progress were possible: that the school could transcend its social context enough to enable it to play a significant role in social reconstruction.[113] If the vigorous, optimistic enthusiasm of Bourne's early educational articles was no longer possible, yet the core of the faith still lived. The emotional edge of the progressive faith may have been blunted by the disillusioning experiences of the war years, but still the editors of the New Republic believed that man was potentially educable and rational; that institutions retained some malleability and plasticity; and that there was still effective work to be done by an educative journalism and a socialized education.

VI. Efficiency, Freedom and Reform

The Nation was in its forty-ninth year when it was joined in the field of liberal journalism by the New Republic. E.L.Godkin's original prospectus for the Nation had, in 1865, declared as one of the journal's main purposes "the fixing of public attention upon the political importance of popular education . . . "[114] This concern for educational matters was still more than evident in the years after 1914.

Dorothy and Willard Straight, who provided the funds for the founding of the New Republic in 1914, were also profoundly interested in education. In fact, according to Walter Lippmann, they originally conferred with Herbert Croly, not about founding a

journal, but about starting "some kind of school, perhaps a university to be located in Washington and to be devoted to education for the public service."[115] The decision was made instead to start a journal of opinion, but the motivation for this venture was equally educational. In fact, throughout the history of the New Republic, one notes a tendency to pair journalism and education as powerful agencies for progress and reform. On the first anniversary of the weekly, in 1915, for example, the editors listed among their most important duties the need to "advocate better schools and press."[116] The editors made clear through words and actions their belief in an alliance of journalists and educators as one hope for progress and reform.

It is evident that the interest in education shown by the journals between 1914 and 1921 was, in the case of the Nation, the continuation of a long-standing tradition, and, for the New Republic, the beginning of another. But while the institutions and processes of education were of continuing interest to the journals, they tended to focus upon particular aspects of it during various periods. During the period surveyed above, the Nation and the New Republic gave special emphasis to the efficiency movement in schools and colleges, to problems of academic freedom, and to the role of educational institutions in the drive for progress and reform.

It is appropriate here to survey briefly the major findings of the preceding material and to assess the role and effects of the liberal journals in regard to educational matters. The chief conclusions are easily summarized:

The first and most significant finding is that there was not during this period a simple one-to-one correlation between political liberalism and educational progressivism. The variety within political progressivism was reflected in a similar diversity of educational positions. This study has utilized two influential journals as indices of liberal thought on education, and has determined that the Nation, while acting as a proponent of the Wilsonian "New Freedom," was often suspicious of progressive developments in the schools; the New Republic, on the other hand, which was a spokesman for Roosevelt's "New Nationalism" was a vigorous partisan of Deweyan educational progressivism. This conclusion is further strengthened when one notes that the Nation's 1918 shift to a political position more like that of the New Republic was accompanied by a movement towards greater sympathy for progressive education as well.

The above finding was supported in varying degrees in three specific case studies. In the first, it was determined that both branches of liberalism, as represented by the two journals, were suspicious of the efficiency movement in education. The pre-1918 Nation resisted scientific management as the incursion into the schools of the industrial-commercial ethos which it found so distasteful; after Villard took over direction of that journal it moved closer to the New Republic's position that efficiency was to be admitted to the schools only as an instrument of progressive democratic values.

Second, it was noted that both journals consistently supported

a greater measure of freedom for instructors at all levels of the educational establishment. But until 1918 the Nation clung to the hope that school boards and university trustees could be rationally persuaded to deal more justly with their staffs and to gradually grant them more autonomy; after the journal became a spokesman for the "new liberalism" it joined the New Republic in calling for vigorous organizational efforts and the use of coercive power by teachers in pursuit of their professional goals.

Third, both journals believed throughout the period that schools and colleges should be instruments of reform. But again the new and old liberalisms expressed this impulse quite differently. Fuller's Nation hoped that the schools might develop more ethical individuals who would raise the moral tone of society and politics. Villard's Nation and Croly's New Republic, on the other hand, thought that broad-gauge social reforms were in order, and promoted educational institutions and curricula which would promote such fundamental economic and political changes.

Since the policies of both the "New Freedom" and the "New Nationalism" have been subsumed above under the general heading of liberalism, it is worth asking what was common to the educational positions of both. Perhaps the fundamental element of continuity between their educational views, as expressed in the Nation and the New Republic, is that educational institutions should be "in but not of" society. While schools and colleges - like other institutions - were the products of the larger social order, they had an integrity of their own. They could not fulfill their social functions by

uncritically transmitting the accepted values, traditions and techniques of the culture. Only by maintaining a certain distance from existing social values could they really serve society.

This basic conviction worked itself out in different ways. The "old liberalism" represented by Fuller attempted to stand somewhat aloof from the developing technical and industrial order, with its corrupt political manifestations. The Nation during this period hoped to improve society by holding fast to traditional classical, cultural values.

The New Republic and the post-1918 Nation felt, on the other hand, that the old tradition in education was no longer viable; but the "new liberals" were also alienated from the conservative, business-dominated civilization in which they found themselves. They called for a plague on both houses - that of genteel classicism and of crass, conservative materialism. They called on the schools to reform themselves - in effect, to form creative communities which could assist in the growth of a more humane and more just society.

Thus the journals urged the schools to be selective in choosing those aspects of culture most worthy of transmission. This was particularly evident in their positions on efficiency in education. Both old and new liberals admitted (although the Nation somewhat reluctantly) that schools needed to adopt some of the efficiency measures which seemed so effective in business and industry. But both urged the schools to do so with discrimination - to use the tools of efficiency but to reject the conservative political

ideology in which the efficiency movement had become enmeshed. Thus in an era when mass periodicals like the Saturday Evening Post and the Ladies Home Journal were calling on schools to make a wholesale adoption of scientific management practices, the liberal journals urged their use with restraint and selectivity.[117] Most important, the New Republic and Villard's Nation insisted that any utilization of scientific efficiency practices in the schools should be accompanied by increased democratization of the educational system.

The above examples illustrate the importance of having outspoken journals defending values somewhat at variance with those of the larger society. Another example may be offered to demonstrate the importance of diversity of opinion within the liberal group. Cremin has pointed out that one of the key weaknesses of progressive education lay in its "inordinate demands on the teacher's time and ability."[118] In their enthusiasm for the innovations being made in education, many partisans of the movement failed to detect this weakness. But Fuller's Nation, lacking sympathy with the progressive trend, and seeking flaws in it, saw the situation clearly and vigorously called attention to it. Had his criticisms, and similar ones made by other observers, been accepted and responded to, the progressive education movement might have been able to devote greater attention and effort to truly innovative teacher education - or at least to hold back on curricular experiments until highly-skilled teachers were available to make their success more likely.

The Nation's and New Republic's vigorous defense of academic

freedom has been explored at length above. But it is worth noting again that some of the force of the journals' position came from the fact that they were themselves the objects of illiberal and anti-intellectual attacks. The dissenting position of the Nation on World War I and of both journals on economic and political issues exposed them to the same kind of harassment to which radical and pacifist educators were subjected. The journals' own sense of alienation and of rejection by respectable and prestigious groups gave strength to their advocacy of intellectual freedom in education as in journalism.

But all the above points refer to the content of the educational ideas promoted by the liberal journals. What can one say of their effects? Here the historian is, of course, in much more treacherous waters. One cannot quantify the impact of ideas on individuals, particularly when the ideas are varied and diffuse and the individuals often unknown. One can only offer impressionistic evidence which suggests that some of the educational material of the journals was "getting through" to the readers. In this case, the available evidence centers around Randolph Bourne. When Bourne's article, "In a Schoolroom" appeared in the first issue of the New Republic, one of the editors, Francis Hackett, wrote Bourne that "at least eight people" including George Pratt of the Pratt Institute, had spoken to him about the piece. The article, according to Hackett, "seemed to express for these people a set of ideas very real to them but inarticulate."[119]

Four months later, upon the appearance of Bourne's article,

"John Dewey's Philosophy," which gave considerable emphasis to Dewey's educational views, Bourne received an enthusiastic letter from James Harvey Robinson of Columbia University. Robinson wrote: "I have just read with very great pleasure your reflection on Professor Dewey." Bourne had lamented the lack of a good collection of some of Dewey's writings, and Robinson asked: "Why cannot an effort be made to get together the scattered things of which you speak? Could you not edit a volume of miscellany?" He closed by offering his assistance and that of some of his colleagues in such a venture.[120]

A less favorable, but no less vigorous response, came from Edgar Dawson, a leader in American social studies education. Provoked by Bourne's New Republic articles on education, Dawson in the space of a week in December, 1914, wrote three letters to Bourne and received two in return. Dawson agreed with Bourne that formalism was one of the fundamental difficulties facing the schools, but felt that little could be done to improve the situation until "the community sees the necessity for appropriating enough money to employ enough teachers to teach." He feared that Bourne was proposing a freer rein for students in an over-crowded situation where more freedom could only lead to chaos.

Dawson played the role of realist in contrast to Bourne's more utopian stance. He declared that "reform which runs ahead of the sense of the community may do more harm than good," adding pessimistically that "the sense of the community, so far as public education is concerned, is in a very unfortunate state." But though he disagreed with some of Bourne's implied educational

prescriptions, it was clear that Dawson welcomed this new critic of education. He felt that Bourne's educational articles showed "a real interest in the problem that lies at the root of democracy" and "a thorough familiarity with the situation" and requested an opportunity to meet with him to continue their discussion of educational matters.[121]

Such responses do not, of course, prove that Bourne's articles had any effect on educational developments, but they do indicate that certain influential educators were much impressed by his ideas. And one can hardly doubt that the impact of Dewey's educational articles in the New Republic exceeded that of Bourne's. Though the Nation carried during this period no educational articles which were as innovative and as incisive as those which appeared in the New Republic, it too had an influential intellectual readership, and one may assume that the educational material - like the other content - of that journal was not without impact.

Thus by 1921, in the Nation's fifty-sixth year and the New Republic's seventh, the liberal journals had established themselves as thoughtful critics of American politics, society, culture and education. During the years to follow, they would never lack for opportunities to exercise their critical functions. And, during some of the discouraging decades to come, they would also find in the world of education forces and movements which would call forth their powers as advocates as well as critics.

NOTES

[1]For information on Bourne, see the biography by Louis Filler, Randolph Bourne (Washington: American Council on Public Affairs, 1943). A recent assessment is given by Henrie Fairlie in "Reconsideration: Randolph Bourne. A Radical and a Patriot," New Republic, 3,554 (2/28/83), 25-32.

[2]This, and the quotations immediately following, are from "In a Schoolroom," New Republic, 1 (11/7/14), 23-4.

[3]Bourne had studied under John Dewey at Columbia University, and shared Dewey's antipathy to dualisms - even those such as thinking and talking. Cf. Filler, p. 37.

[4]The phrase is from the title of Raymond Callahan's book, The Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964; first published in 1962).

[5]A working definition of the troublesome term "liberal" will be provided below.

[6]Evidence concerning the influence of these journals will be provided below.

[7]Charles Forcey, The Crossroads of Liberalism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961); D. Joy Humes, Oswald Garrison Villard, Liberal of the 1920's (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1960); Alan P. Grimes, The Political Liberalism of the New York Nation (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953); Michael Wreszin, Oswald Garrison Villard: Pacifist at War (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965); Richard H. Pells, Radical Visions and American Dreams (New York: Harper and Row, 1973). See also Richard H. Gentry, "Liberalism and the New Republic: 1914-1960" (Urbana: Ph. D. Thesis, University of Illinois, 1960 - microfilm).

[8]Lawrence Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961). For Forcey's discussion of the old and new liberalism, see The Crossroads of Liberalism, pp. 25-44 and passim.

[9]Rush Welter, Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962). Welter cites two of Croly's books and nine of Lippmann's. The only article by either man which he refers to is one which Croly wrote for the Independent. Cf. Welter, pp. 267-276; 379-80, and 427.

[10]Cf. Welter, pp. 194-5; 198; 203; 368-9.

[11]Charles R. Foster, Editorial Treatment of Education in The American Press (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938); Claude Bowman, The College Professor in America, 1890-1938 (Philadelphia, 1938); Sister Mary R. Sandifer, American Lay Opinion of the Progressive School (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1943); Doyle M. Bortner, "A Study of Published Lay Opinion on Educational Programs and Problems" (Philadelphia: Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1950).

[12]Arthur Mann, for example, in his essay, "The Progressive Tradition," uses the terms "progressive" and "liberal" interchangeably. This essay appears in The Reconstruction of American History, edited by John Higham (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962).

[13]J. Salwyn Schapiro traces the European background of liberalism and its history in America in Liberalism: Its Meaning and History (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1958). See especially Chapter 8. Eric Goldman gives 1872 as the year in which the term first received general use in American politics: Rendezvous with Destiny (New York: Vintage, 1956; first published in 1952 by Alfred Knopf), p. 20. This is also cited by Gentry, p. 5.

[14]See Grimes, chapters 2 and 3 for the post-Civil War role of the Nation.

[15]See William E. Leuchtenberg's introduction to Wilson's The New Freedom for a discussion of the areas of agreement and disagreement between Wilson's and Roosevelt's 1912 programs. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961). The New Freedom was first published in 1913.

[16]Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. describes the process of "Nationalizing the New Freedom" in chapter 5 of The Crisis of the Old Order, 1919-1933 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957). Herbert Croly, who founded the New Republic in 1914, proposed "Hamiltonian means for Jeffersonian ends" in his influential book, The Promise of American Life, published in 1909. (New York: Capricorn Books, 1964 edition).

[17]Grimes, pp. 67-8; Forcey, ch. 4. For a fairly explicit definition of the differences between Croly and the Nation in 1910, see W. M. Daniels' review of Croly's The Promise of American Life: Nation, 90 (3/3/10), 209-211.

[18]Forcey, p. 255.

[19]Henry May, The End of American Innocence (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964 - first published in 1951), p. 296. See also Oswald G. Villard, Fighting Years (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1939), ch. 19.

[20]Beulah Amidon, "The Nation and the New Republic," Survey Graphic, 29 (January, 1940), 21, 26.

[21]Forcey, p. 174; James P. Wood, Magazines in the United States (New York: Ronald Press, 1956 - first edition, 1949), p. 186. Similar pairings of the two may be found in Cremin, p. 232; Theodore Peterson, Magazines in the Twentieth Century (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956), p. 364; and Frederick J. Hoffman, The Twenties (New York: Viking, 1955), p.337.

[22]Samuel E. Morison and Henry S. Commager, The Growth of the American Republic, Vol. II (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949 - third revised edition), p. 294; Sidney Kaplan, "Social Engineers as Saviors," Journal of the History of Ideas, 17 (June, 1956), 351; Forcey, pp. 265-66. See also Arthur Ekirch, Jr., Progressivism in America (New York: New Viewpoints, 1974), p. 158.

[23]Croly, The Promise, pp. 153-4. Also quoted in Gentry, p. 54.

[24]Forcey, p. 292; Humes, p. 12.

[25]Quoted in Malcolm Cowley and Bernard Smith, editors, Books that Changed our Minds (New York: Doubleday, 1939), pp. 8-9. Also cited in Grimes, vi, footnote.

[26]Forcey, p. 21; May, p. 149.

[27]Peterson, pp. 365, 369-71; May, p. 317.

[28]May, pp. 322-8; 103, 297, 392; Forcey, p. 283.

[29]The Nation and the New Republic are the only liberal journals which have consistently been listed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature.

[30]Cf. Forcey, passim, for the New Republic's relationships with Roosevelt. Cf. also "The First Forty Years," New Republic, 131 (November, 1954; Fortieth Anniversary Issue), 10.

[31]Gentry, p. vi.

[32]Walter Lippmann, The Public Philosophy (New York: New American Library, 1956), p. 94. On the intellectual boundaries of liberalism, see also Arthur Mann's essay in Higham, Reconstruction, p. 164.

[33]1914 is a standard historical breaking point. For example, Samuel Hays' book The Response to Industrialism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957) ends with the year 1914; Slosson takes that year as the starting point for The Great Crusade and After.

[34]Carl N. Degler identifies 1914 as the peak year for the Progressive movement. Cf. Out of Our Past (New York: Harper, 1959), 366.

[35]Cremin, pp. x, 85-89. Except where specifically noted, comments such as this are not intended to be evaluative. Each of the authors cited has had particular interests and could not be expected to explore all the details which might appeal to another student of the subject.

[36]A convenient source on the variety within the progressive movement is Arthur Mann (ed.), The Progressive Era: Liberal Renaissance or Liberal Failure? (New York: Holt, 1963). J.J. Hutchmacher's essay identifies Croly with the left-wing reform of the urban lower classes; the Nation fits easily into the more moderate middle-class progressivism of the urban gentry described by George Mowry. Cf. pp. 28 ff., 45.

[37]Welter, chapters 12 and 16.

[38]Croly, Weyl, and Lippmann were "avowedly pragmatists, relativists in morals and anti-Jeffersonian in their liberal persuasion." Forcey, p. 145.

[39]"Our Educational Prospect," unsigned review of John and Evelyn Dewey's Schools of Tomorrow, New Republic, 3 (6/26/15), 210-11.

[40]"The Public Schools," unsigned review of Schools of Tomorrow, by John and Evelyn Dewey, Nation, 101 (9/9/15), 326-7.

[41]Cremin's book includes brief citations from both reviews, but they are not compared nor is there any indication that they were expressions of divergent brands of liberalism. Cf. pp. 120n, 126.

[42]Walter Lippmann, "The Hope of Democracy," (review of John Dewey's Democracy and Education), New Republic, 7 (7/1/16), 231.

[43]"Dewey's Philosophy of Education." (review by Warner Fite of Democracy and Education, Nation, 102 (5/4/16), 480-81.

[44]Walter Lippmann, Drift and Mastery (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961 - first published in 1914), ch. 15.

[45]Letter from W. M. Stone, Nation, 108 (4/5/19), 503. The circulation of the Nation increased from 8,467 in 1918 to 38,087 in 1919.

[46]Cremin, p. 221.

[47]Boyd H. Bode, "Reconstruction in Philosophy," (review of John Dewey's book by that title), Nation, 111 (12/8/20), 658-60.

[48]Humes writes that Villard reflected "a basic characteristic of American liberalism - that of pragmatism, which requires that all social institutions be evaluated in terms of their practical consequences for democratic ideals." p. 105.

[49]"An Independent College of Political Science," editorial, Nation, 106 (5/11/18), 559-60. Morton White describes the New School as "the shrine of academic liberalism in the twenties." Cf. Social Thought in America (Boston: Beacon Press, rev. ed., 1957), p. 193.

Croly, Alvin Johnson, and Dorothy Straight were among those associated with the liberal journals who were instrumental in the founding of the New School. Some of the planning sessions were held at the New Republic offices. (Interview with Alvin Johnson, 11/17/65).

[50]" A New Educational Venture," Nation, 107 (9/7/18), 264-5.

[51]Raymond Callahan has considered this problem at length in Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Our purpose here is to explore the issue from the standpoint of the liberal journals and to stress more strongly than Callahan the fact that liberals - because of their partial alienation from the business ethos - were in a position to be peculiarly sensitive to the problems involved.

[52]Walter Lippmann, A Preface to Politics. Quoted in Forcey, p. 112.

[53]For the changing views of the New Republic group on businessmen and reform, see Forcey, pp. 112, 215, 164 ff.

[54]Hofstadter draws on Grimes' study in placing Godkin's Nation in the "status revolution" framework. The Nation of More and Fuller may be analyzed in the same terms. Cf. Richard Hofstadter, The Age of Reform (New York: Vintage Books, 1960 - first published in 1955), pp. 142-3.

[55]May, pp. 132-6.

[56]Cf. May, 135; also Samuel P. Hays, Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 265, 270-71. This book deals with similar problems in a quite different field. The most comprehensive study of this movement, however, is Samuel Haber's Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

[57]Editorial, "Democratic Control of Scientific Management," New Republic, 9 (12/23/16), 204-5; Walter Lippmann, "The Puzzle of Hughes," 8 (9/30/16), 210-13.

[58]Bourne, "Education as Living," New Republic, 8 (8/5/16), 10-12.

[59]Callahan notes that as early as 1911 and 1912, educational leaders like J. F. Bobbitt were citing the Gary schools in this way. Cf. pp. 130-134.

[60]Bourne, "Schools in Gary," New Republic, 2 (3/27/15), 198-9.

[61]Bourne, "Communities for Children," New Republic, 2 (4/3/15), 233-4. The other articles in the series were: "Really Public Schools," 2 (4/10/15), 259-61; "Apprentices to the Schools," 2 (4/24/15), 302-3; and "The Natural School," 2 (5/1/15), 326-8.

[62]Bourne, The Gary Schools (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916).

[63]Cremin holds that Dewey's Schools of Tomorrow and Bourne's articles in the New Republic were major factors in creating public interest in the Gary Schools. (Cf. pp. 153-8).

[64]John Dewey, review of Helen Marot's Creative Industry, New Republic, 17 (11/2/18), 20, 23.

[65]The above quotations are all from an editorial, "The National Education Association," Nation, 102 (6/29/16), 690-91.

[66]Editorial, Nation, 99 (12/3/14), 648-9.

[67]This phrase was used in the editorial on the National Education Association meeting. Nation, v. 102, p. 691.

[68]Harold J. Laski, Review of Thorstein Veblen's The Higher Learning in America, New Republic, 17 (1/11/19), 317-18.

[69]"Our Commercialized Universities," review of Thorstein Veblen's The Higher Learning in America, Nation, 108 (2/22/19), 286-8.

[70]Cf. Veblen, "The Technicians and Revolution," (1921) in The Portable Veblen, ed. Max Lerner (New York: Viking Press, 1948), pp. 438-65.

[71]The above analysis of Veblen is based on his writings and on the reviewer's reading of him. It is quite likely that he was not as aloof and disinterested as he tried to appear. Cf. Morton White, Social Thought in America (Boston: Beacon Press, 1957 - revised edition), pp. 89-93.

[72]This was the title of a Nation editorial on academic freedom; v. 102 (2/9/21), 199-200.

[73]Morris Jastrow, "Professors in Council," Nation, 100 (2/4/15), 146-7. On the founding of the A.A.U.P., see Walter

P, Netzger, Academic Freedom in the Age of the University (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961 - first published in 1955), p. 194 ff.

[74]Metzger, pp. 200-203.

[75]Editorial, New Republic, 1 (1/9/15), 4-5.

[76]Editorial, Nation, 100 (6/24/15), 698. Cf. also 106 (1/24/18), 79.

[77]F. I. Davenport, "Reconstructing Boards of Education," New Republic, 2 (4/3/15), 229-30.

[78]Editorial, New Republic, 3 (7/17/15), 269-70. A similar statement, objecting to exclusive university government by trustees as "absentee landlordism," appeared in an editorial on March 10, 1917: (v. 3, pp. 149-50).

[79]Editorial, Nation, 107 (11/23/18), 613.

[80]Editorial Nation, 111 (8/21/20), 202-3. An indication of the Nation's disaffection from its earlier "old liberal" sympathies was its sarcastic use of Wilson's term, "new freedom." Croly had decided some time before that the new freedom might better be called "the old bondage."

[81]Editorial, "The Unionizing of Professors," Nation, 119 (8/23/19), 237.

[82]Croly, Lippmann and Villard were Harvard graduates; Weyl was a graduate of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. Cf. Forcey, pp. 11, 53, 101; Humes, p. 8. For the readership of the journals, see Wood, p. 189, and Forcey, p. 175. Forcey writes that the New Republic was aimed at "teachers, professors, civil servants, social workers, enlightened politicians and businessmen."

[83]Editorial, New Republic, 3 (6/26/15), 185-6.

[84]Editorial, The Outlook, 116 (8/29/17), 644-6.

[85]Villard, p. 354 ff.

[86]Cremin, pp. 288; 179.

[87]Cremin, p. 85.

[88]Welter, p. 285. See pages 283-9 for a fuller definition of the conservative position on education during this period.

[89]Editorial, Nation, 99 (12/17/14), 705..

[90]Harold Fuller, "The Gary System," Nation, 102 (6/29/16), 699.

[91]Warner Fite, "The State University Idea," Nation, 101 (9/9/15), 322-4.

[92]Editorial, Nation, 102 (6/29/16), 691.

[93]Concern for Blacks was a tradition with the Nation's owners and editors. The first literary editor of the journal was William Lloyd Garrison's son; the current owner, Oswald Garrison Villard, was his grandson. Cf. Villard, ch. I.

[94]Nation, 100 (2/18/15), 187-5.

[95]Thorstein Veblen, The Theory of the Leisure Class (New York: Mentor, 1953), p,133. (First published in 1899).

[96]Bourne, Education and Living, p. vi.

[97]Bourne, "John Dewey's Philosophy," New Republic, 2 (3/13/15), 153.

[98]For a listing of Dewey's articles, see Milton Thomas, John Dewey: A Centennial Bibliography (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 41-63. See also Jo Ann Boydston, "John Dewey and the Journals," History of Education Quarterly, X, #1 (Spring, 1970), 72-77.

[99]Dewey, "A Policy of Industrial Education," New Republic, 1 (12/19/14), 11-12.

[100]Dewey, "Splitting Up the School System," New Republic, (4/17/15), 283-4.

[101]Cf. Welter, pp. 271-6. Lippmann wrote that the purpose of the New Republic "was not partisan, factional, personal or ideological; it was educational." Quoted by Gilbert Harrison in the foreword to Walter Lippmann, Early Writings, Introduction and Annotations by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (New York: Liveright, 1970), p. viii.

[102]Lippmann, "Insiders and Outsiders," New Republic, 5 (11/13/15), 35-6.

[103]In Drift and Mastery, for example, Lippmann recognized the role of the unconscious in politics and life, but advocated "the substitution of conscious intention for unconscious striving." (p. 148)

[104]William L. Stoddard, "The Boston Trade Union College," Nation, 109 (8/30/19), 298-300. Cf. also 106 (5/4/18), 541-3, where a review of fifteen educational books showed considerable sympathy for progressive innovations.

[105]Review, "Books in Brief," Nation, 111 (9/4/20), 277. The reviewer was Dorothy Brewster.

[106]Editorial note, Nation, 112 (2/23/21), 279. The note was written by Carl Van Doren.

[107]Laski, "British Labor and Direct Action," Nation, 106 (8/21/20), 214-15.

[108]M. H. Hedges, "The Teacher's Real Dilemma," Nation 111 (8/21/20), 214-15.

[109]Cf. Cremin, ch. 6; also Sidney Kaplan, "Social Engineers as Saviors," Journal of the History of Ideas, 17 (June, 1956), 347-369.

[110]This, and the succeeding quotations, are from an editorial titled "Americanism in Education," New Republic, 19 (5/10/19), 38-40.

[111] Welter, p. 301.

[112]The editors were quoting from Dewey's Democracy and Education (New York: Macmillan, 1961 - 1st edition, 1916), p. 317.

[113]The phrase "Twilight of Idols" was originally the title of an article in which the disillusioned Bourne indicted Dewey for his support of the war. The Seven Arts, II (Oct., 1917), 688-702.

[114]Quoted in One Hundred Years of the Nation: A Centennial Anthology, Henry M. Christman, ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1965), p. 27.

[115]Walter Lippmann, "Remarks on the Occasion of this Journal's 50th Year," New Republic, 150 (3/21/64), 14. See also Michael Straight, After Long Silence (New York: Norton, 1983), p. 158.

[116]Quoted in "The New Republic: 1914-1954," New Republic, 131 (12/6/54), 17.

[117]Cf. Callahan, pp. 52-53 regarding magazine support for the efficiency movement in education.

[118]Cremin, pp. 348-9.

[119]Letter from Hackett to Bourne, 11/16/14, (Bourne papers).

[120]Letter from Robinson to Bourne, 3/13/15, (Bourne papers).

[121]Letters from Dawson to Bourne, 12/14/14, 12/16/14, 12/21/14, (Bourne papers).